### Case 1:16-cr-00469-ELH Document 29 Filed 11/22/16 Page 1 of 47

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
NORTHERN DISTRICT

- - - - - - - X

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : Criminal No. 16-00469-JFM

:

V.

MARTIN ROBERT HALL,

Defendant. : Baltimore, Maryland

:

---- x October 14, 2016

#### **HEARING**

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE J. MARK COULSON, Judge

APPEARANCES: PAUL E. BUDLOW, Esq.

Office of the U.S. Attorney

36 S. Charles Street

Fourth Floor

Baltimore, Maryland 21202 On Behalf of the Government

SCOTT ROSENBLUM, Esq. MARK JOHNSON, Esq.

Rosenblum Schwartz Rogers

and Glass, P.C.

120 S. Central Avenue, Suite 130

St. Louis, Missouri 63105 On Behalf of the Defendant

Also Present: HELEN DONOVAN, PTS

Audio Operator: Jill Klein

Transcription Company: CompuScribe

5100 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 101

Lanham, Maryland 20706

Proceeding recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

Page

### INDEX

T N D F Y					
Preliminary Matters					Page 3
On <u>Initial</u> <u>Appearance</u> :  Court Inquires of De	efendant				4
On Detention Hearing:  by Paul E. Budlow, 1  On behalf of the Go	-				7
by Scott Rosenblum, On behalf of the De	-				23
by Paul E. Budlow, Esq. On behalf of the Government					38
by Scott Rosenblum, Esq. On behalf of the Defendant					39
WITNESSES For the Defendant:	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS	
Belinda Hall	28	34			

Finding:			
by The Honorable	J. Mark Coulson,	Judge	40
On Arraignment:			

by Scott Rosenblum, Esq.
On behalf of the Defendant 44

KEYNOTE: "---" Indicates inaudible in transcript.

## 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (Whereupon, at 2:17 p.m., the proceedings began.) 3 MR. BUDLOW: Should I call the case? 4 THE COURT: Yes, please. 5 MR. BUDLOW: This is the United States of America versus Martin Robert Hall. It is Criminal No. JFM-16469. 6 7 This matter is scheduled before Your Honor this afternoon for 8 an arraignment and a detention hearing and potentially an 9 initial appearance, as well. The Defendant has had an 10 initial appearance on the criminal complaint. 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 MR. BUDLOW: But this would be his first appearance 13 on this Indictment. 14 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rosenblum. 15 MR. ROSENBLUM: Yes, Your Honor, Scott Rosenblum 16 from St. Louis, Missouri, along with Mark Johnson, here on 17 behalf of Mr. Hall. 18 THE COURT: Well, welcome. 19 MR. ROSENBLUM: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Hall --21 THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 2.2 THE COURT: -- good afternoon, you can be seated. 23 (Pause) 24 THE COURT: So, do we want to proceed with an 25 initial appearance on the Indictment?

MR. BUDLOW: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So, we will start there.

All right. Mr. Hall, you are in court today because a Grand

Jury of this Court has returned an Indictment against you.

The Indictment alleges certain violations of Federal Law.

So, the initial appearance is your opportunity to find out

exactly what is being charged, also what the maximum

penalties would be if you are convicted of the charges.

I am going to talk to you about two important

Constitutional Rights that you have and then we are going to
go on to address some other matters, including, I believe,
having you enter a plea in response to the Indictment in the
case, and then also discussing your detention or your release
status pending your next court appearance.

So, this is obviously not a trial on the charges, but it is your opportunity, first, to find out exactly what you are being charged with and what the maximum penalties would be. Do you United States so far?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Sir.

THE COURT: And are you able to read, write and understand English?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Today are you under the influence of any substance or do you have any medical condition that would interfere with your ability to understand the

24

25

```
1
     proceedings?
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: No, Sir.
               THE COURT: Have you had the opportunity to review
 3
 4
     the Indictment with your Counsel?
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Sir.
 5
 6
               THE COURT: So, under the Indictment it appears
7
     that you are charged in two counts, Count No. 1 is
 8
     transportation of child pornography in violation of Title 18
 9
     of the United States Code Section 2252(a)(1). That count
10
     carries the mandatory minimum sentence of five years and a
11
     maximum sentence of 20 years, a $250,000.00 fine and lifetime
12
     supervised release.
13
               You are also charged in Count 2, possession of
     child pornography in violation of Title 18 of the United
14
15
     States Code Section 2252(a) -- (a)(5)(b), if convicted under
16
     that count that has a maximum penalty of 20 years in prison,
17
     a $250,000.00 fine and also lifetime supervised release.
18
               So, Mr. Hall, I am not asking you whether you agree
19
     with the charges but do you understand what the charges are
20
     and what the maximum penalties would be?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
2.2
               THE COURT: Understand, Mr. Hall, those are the
23
    maximum penalties. That is not necessarily the sentence that
```

you would receive if you were convicted, it is the maximum

sentence that you could receive.

25

1 Mr. Hall, you have two important Constitutional Rights. Under the Fifth Amendment, you have the right to 2 3 remain silent. You do not have to make any statement to the 4 Government about the charges. If you do make a statement then they can use it against you in court. 5 And then under the Sixth Amendment you have the 6 7 right to be represented by Counsel at all stages of the 8 proceedings from this point forward. That means that you 9 have the right to have your lawyer with you during any 10 questioning by the Government and also have your lawyer with 11 you for all of your court appearances. So, let us do this, if we could. Mr. Budlow, is 12 13 the Government seeking Mr. Hall's detention in the case? 14 MR. BUDLOW: Yes, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: All right. So, I guess the question is 16 -- do we want to proceed with the detention hearing now or do we need to schedule another date for the detention hearing. 17 18 MR. BUDLOW: Your Honor, I believe that the 19 detention hearing was scheduled for today. And that --20 THE COURT: All right. 21 MR. BUDLOW: -- Counsel flew in from Missouri. 22 THE COURT: Very well. So, we are ready to 23 proceed. 24 MR. ROSENBLUM: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Budlow, I will hear

from you first.

MR. BUDLOW: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, the Government is seeking detention in this case based on both risk of flight and danger to the community. I would point out that this is a presumption case. And that the Defendant is presumed detained. And that the Defendant -- either a lack of assurance of the Defendant's appearance or safety to the community, it is sufficient to detain the Defendant. Not both. Either is sufficient.

Your Honor, I will give the Court a proffer of the facts that are the subject of this investigation that both led to the search warrant of the Defendant's home as well as the Indictment in this case, which you have, and then some additional facts that the Government believes relate to the Defendant's danger to the community and his risk of flight.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BUDLOW: Your Honor, Baltimore County searched the Defendant's residence after an undercover investigation into what I would call an encrypted file sharing and storing platform, which is known as Pre-Net. Showed that an IP address from the Defendant's house was transporting child pornography. Pre-Net is a Peer-to-Peer encrypted platform for storing and delivering data. It is a highly sophisticated platform, the communication is encrypted, the

files are stored in very small encrypted blocks on hundreds or even thousands of various users' computers.

The users participate in this file sharing with the understanding that they do not know what files they share bits and pieces of on the various computers that are in an encrypted states, so they would not do them any good to try and look at those encrypted files in any event.

In order for one user to obtain a particular file that user needs to obtain a key, which is similar to a password. That key then sends a message to other users of the program and it tells them to send the encrypted packets or sections of data back to the user, where the program puts all of those packets back together, un-encrypts them if you will and recreates the file or files that have been requested on the beginning user's device.

That is essentially the program that the undercover investigator from Baltimore County was investigating when he saw the Defendant's IP address with information that led him to believe that it was connected to a specific packet of files. And the detective knew based on his experience that that unique information that he obtained from the IP address contained two known videos of child pornography.

I am going to describe those videos of child pornography. This is the -- these are the videos that the detective recognize as linking to the Defendant's IP address.

These videos were not downloaded by the detective, nor where they ultimately recovered from the Defendant's residence or from his computers, at least not at this time. A full forensic exam has not been done.

The first video is three and a half minutes long and it depicts a nude prepubescent female lying on a bed with her legs spread, the prepubescent female's face is not seen and the adult male enters the video and penetrates the female's vagina with his penis until he ejaculates on the minor's vagina.

The second video is one minute long, approximately. It also depicts a nude prepubescent female masturbating herself and then an adult male digitally penetrates the minor and perform oral sex on her.

Those two videos were in data that linked to the Defendant's IP address. The detective took that information and applied for and obtained a search and seizure warrant, which was executed on the Defendant's house on September 7th, 2016.

When the detective arrived they observed that the Defendant's computers were all encrypted and you will the Defendant is a fairly sophisticated computer user. But fortunate for the investigators at the time of the search warrant one of the computers was running and it was connected to an external hard drive. Which allowed the investigators

to do an on-scene forensic exam of those items, at least in part without having to worry about encryption for the short term.

What they learned was that on the Defendant's external hard drive was a significant amount of prepubescent and child exploitation appears. They identified over 8,000 files of child erotica, prepubescent and related materials. They noticed that many of the subjects of the subjects of the photographs and videos appeared to be Asian and potentially Filipino.

The images included the following three imagines -well, the images included prepubescent minors engaging in sex
acts with adults including three that I am going to describe.
And they formed the basis of Count 2 of the Indictment in
part.

The first one is an imagine of an adult penis penetrating a prepubescent female's vagina. The second one is a prepubescent female performing oral sex on an adult male. And the third one is an adult male's penis penetrating an Asian prepubescent female's vagina. Again that is the images and the types of images that form the basis of Count 2.

Also located on the Defendant's computer were images of the Defendant engaging in sex acts with a young female of what the detectives determined to be undetermined

age. And these videos or images were produced using a camera, make and model which was the same make and model camera that was found in the Defendant's office where the computers were found. I say office, I think it was either a basement or office somewhere in his residence.

Additionally, there were pornographic images, lascivious display, not sex acts, of photographs using the same type of camera, the same make and model camera as were found -- as the ones that depicted the Defendant engaging in the sex acts with the young female, also the same make and model camera found in the Defendant's home.

Those images are as follows. Seven image files which depicted one individual listed in the Indictment as Jane Doe. Who is a minor female, she is partially naked, three of which are focused on Jane Doe's vagina. Again, those images form the basis for Count 1, transportation of child pornography and I will explain a little bit more about additional evidence with the transportation of child pornography charge in the moment.

THE COURT: But there is no charge at this point for production?

MR. BUDLOW: There is not. There is -- significant amount of evidence indicating production relating to that image, which I will detail, but the Defendant is not currently charged with that.

The Defendant gave a statement at the scene. He stated that the images of him engaging in sex acts with other individuals, he admitted that that was him and that it was one of his Filipino girlfriends, which he had spent time with during his recent trip to the Philippines. He had been in the Philippines between April and August of 2016.

He also admitted that the young girl depicted in the image in Count 1, we just discussed is the basis for the transportation images, was his girlfriend's sister. But that he denied taking any photos of the sister. And he did state that he believed that that young sister depicted in the photograph was either age 12 or 13.

The Defendant stated that he travels to the Philippines for work where he teaches JAVA code and that the women there in the Philippines like their American boyfriends. He denied any child pornography or child exploitation related active or possessing the images of child pornography.

Defendant and his wife both stated in interviews that only the Defendant uses the devices which were found in his office, which are the devises where all the images that we are discussing are located. The Defendant also stated that he purchases his computer devices new.

THE COURT: Mr. Budlow, did you say that you -that the investigators had somehow linked the pictures of the

minors that you just described with Mr. Hall's camera?

MR. BUDLOW: Correct. Based on the make and model. At this point in the forensic exam they have not determined the -- I do not know if there is any information relating to the serial numbers. It is the same make and model.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BUDLOW: Other information found in the Defendant's possession nor on the Defendant's computer and external hard drive that were viewable at the scene, thousands of images of child pornography and erotica. Which were on his encrypted hard drive. The Defendant and his wife both stated that he is the user of the device, he stated that he purchased the equipment new.

The Defendant's home IP address -- this again is a summary of the evidence related to Count 2, possession -- the Defendant's home IP address was observed by the undercover detective sharing or disseminating or some relationship to these bits of image files that are known child pornography. Based on the number of files on the Defendant's computer and they type of files the Government submits that there is sufficient evidence for the Court to determine that the Defendant has a sexual interest in children.

Additionally, there are the photos of the Defendant

from the Philippines which show -- there are other photos of the Defendant from his recent trip to the Philippines and earlier trip to the Philippines that show him with various families. When I say families they typically appear to be a young woman, no adult male, who typically had young female children with them. What their relationship, of course I do not know.

In one of these photographs of sort of a family vacation if you will, where the Defendant is with his family -- with a young woman and a young Filipino children is a photo of a young girl, clearly under the age of ten, prepubescent, going down the slide a couple of times. The first time she goes down the slide clothed. Later on in the photograph she goes down the slide, no -- either no underwear or -- her bottom is exposed and her legs are spread exposing her vagina to the camera.

Those photographs were also taken with the same camera make and model that was located in the Defendant's office and that was used to take the images -- the Defendant having sex acts with a woman as well as the woman's younger daughter in a lascivious display --

THE COURT: And those photos are from a time frame when Mr. Hall was known to be in the Philippines?

MR. BUDLOW: That is correct.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BUDLOW: So, the evidence that relates to

Count 1, the transportation of child pornography with

respect to those seven images of what the Defendant said was

12 or 13 old sister of his Filipino girlfriend, are as

follows. And a lot of this you have already heard but just

to sort of put it in one place and so that the Court

understands the strength of the case against the Defendant

for this count.

Again, the Defendant had purchased this computer and these hard drives new presumably, without child pornography on them. The Defendant's computer contained images of a young Filipino girl clothed and then unclothed focused on her vagina. And these are the Count 1, so that series of seven photos is a series that starts clothed going to unclothed and then going to focusing on the victim's vagina.

The images again were taken using the same make and model camera seized from the Defendant's home. The images were taken during a time when the Defendant can be shown to be in the Philippines. The admitted that the photos of this girl is the younger sister of his Filipino girlfriend.

So, in a nutshell, the Defendant traveled to the Philippines, these photos were taken while he was there, likely by him, he brought the images back with him either on

a hard drive or on his camera and that is the evidence of his transportation for Count 1.

And as the Court asked me earlier and I responded, he is not currently charged with production but all of those facts are significant evidence of his production. And whether or not there is probable cause or stronger evidence at this time is not really the point. I think those are all relevant facts for the Court to consider when determining how much of a danger the Defendant presents.

I would point out that in addition to the danger in that the area the Defendant is highly sophisticated and he has conduct that shows that he has attempted to avoid being caught and avoid law enforcement. And that is that all his computers are encrypted. His computers did contain wiping software. And there is a chat that I have just recently received from his Skype account to at least one of the women that he is talking to he had specifically instructs to delete the chats.

Additionally there is evidence of the Defendant's travel. The Defendant has traveled to many countries throughout Europe and Asia including many known to be popular destinations for sex tours and specifically child sex tours, including the Philippines, Thailand, Cambodia, Taiwan and Indonesia. Other countries as well, but specifically has been to those countries all known for that kind of activity.

Your Honor, I this morning received some small amount of the forensic results from different searches on the Defendant's devices, that I think are also relevant on the issue of detention.

There is a Yahoo chat and all it is, is one line, that is all that was extracted out of there. And it is clearly from an account associated with the Defendant, which I think is also relevant. It is "T-r-a-v underscore M-a-n underscore 1969". So, Trav Man 1969. And that is the same or similar name or moniker that he uses for some of his other social media platforms. And the chat, all we have says, "I want to meet the younger one".

Additionally within the Google searches that were pulled from the Defendant's computer was the search for "Best Eraser Settings" unquote.

And then there is a Fire Fox web history. And the web history only shows two dates, September 3rd and September 6th of 2016, which were just days before the Defendant's house was search. And I would indicate that given the evidence of him having search for eraser and having wiping software that he either manually deleted his search history on all of these internet browsers and other computer related activity regularly or he set it up so that his computer would do it automatically. But in any event it

clearly had not deleted these things from just a couple of days before the Defendant -- the Defendant's home was searched.

And these searches all relate to a web history where the search history on Fire Fox, all relates to a web history for a web site called, "M-r-d-o-u-b-l-e.bz" or Mr. Double dot BZ. And the case agent who got stuck on a search warrant today or would have been here, but she is still there now, did a little digging and learned that that website, Mr. Double dot BZ, is a site offering 30,000 or more taboo teen incest stories, which are stories about rape and child molestation.

So, on September 3rd there is one to hit. And then on September 6th, 2013 there is a variety of zip files that are seen on the extension of the Defendant's search history all related to the Mr. Double dot BZ website. And the file names associated with those zips are as follows.

I will just give you a preview or the end of it, one is "Tooyoung03.zip", one is "Kidspics.zip", "Angel.zip", "Alicia.zip", "Poollove.zip" and "Marycath.zip". (All website names are spelled phonetically.)

Your Honor, finally there is a Skype log, Skype being a video chat platform but also regular chat through texting and it is clear from the Defendant's Skype log that he was communicating both by video and sending photographs

and text chat on Skype. The log goes from at least January of 2015 until the summer of 2016 and maybe even more recent than that.

Now, I will tell, Your Honor, obviously at this state typically the Defense has no discovery. This case is no exception. Up until now they have had nothing. I have provided the Defense this extremely small font summary of these chats. And so, I am going to try and stay very general in my description and conservative.

What -- and the subject to the if the Defense wants to point something out in here if you can read that -- then I will take it back.

But what is clear, I think, from these chats is that the Defendant is communicating with women and it is highly sexual talk. Much of the talk relates to having sex with the person that he is talking to. The vast majority of the time it is unclear the age of that individual.

However, there is a lot of discussion with sort of the target of his conversation about others who are younger, they seem to be younger sisters or younger friends and family members that are there, and there are lots of conversations relating to so-and-so is too young. And so that would be coming from someone, it appears to be in the Philippines. The Defendant is saying this individual was too young.

To be clear there is no definitive text from the Defendant to which that is responding to. So, for example, I cannot say the Defendant specifically stated that he wanted to have sex with their sister and she says no, my sister is too young. It is just that the response is seen and a number of these contain information like that person is too young. And again the Government puts this in the context of the vast majority of these texts are sexual in nature and explicit.

Additionally, there is clearly images that are being shared because you can see that the individual that the Defendant is talking to sends texts, that might just say, ".4-JPEG" and things like that. And I am just going to read to the Court some of the text message that seem to show the Defendant's activity. Some of these are messages to him.

One time he says, "I like young". There is another text message where he receives a number of photographs from someone and states, "Who is the cute baby" and cute is spelled C-u-u-u-u-t-e baby.

There is a sexual explicit conversation with someone who is identified by user name and it is -- at this point I cannot say whether this user name is supplied by Skype from the user or whether the Defendant edited it as somebody he knew, but it is "Nicole Areola" and in

parenthesis it says, "Medium Plus Plus Braces 15 Ninth GD Consolation FC 15A" and then there is something else, on something. There is conversation with this individual where she indicates that she is in the ninth grade. The text messages are clear that she has a sister, who got pregnant, that sister is 17.

So, I think it is a fair reading of this to see that the Defendant is engaging in sexual conversations with someone he believes to be a sixteen year old high school/middle age student in the Philippines.

Additionally, there is conversation with the Defendant and this person, Nicole, about potentially getting together.

The last text I see or the second to the last text, from this individual, Nicole, says, "I hope so mahal (sic.) only that month is my vacation, in June back to school again. You have to time to think about it if you will not be here, then it's all right".

So, it is certainly appears, whether or not they ever saw each other is unclear at this point until there has been a more detailed review, but there is discussion of getting together.

Your Honor, in summary, the Government believes that detention is appropriate because the Defendant is a danger. He is a danger to children wherever they are. There

is a presumption of the danger -- of detention. The

Defendant possessed thousands of images of child pornography,
including prepubescent children engaging in sex acts. He has
engaged in extensive sexual chat including exchanging video
and images with young women and girls overseas, all who
appear to have younger siblings and daughters who seem to be
the focus of the conversation.

The discussion appears to involve sex of talk with minors. It clearly talks about involving sex with people for the first time, girls losing their virginity, girls waiting or not waiting until they are 18 to have sex.

The Defendant clearly travels extensively to countries know for sex and child sex tours. He admits in his interview that he has girlfriends in the Philippines that he has sex with, who we know have younger siblings and daughters.

He clearly, from his online activity and from his computer activity has a sexual interest in children. He has on his computer child pornography of a minor girl that he admits is his girlfriend's sister, taken with his camera while he was in the Philippines. That is strong evidence, that is a strong indication that the Defendant took those photographs and produced those images.

The Defendant clearly represents a threat to children wherever he is. He is highly sophisticated both in

computers, he has traveled extensively throughout Europe,
North America, South America, Asia. He clearly is facing
mandatory minimum time in this case based on the current
Indictment of five to twenty years, potentially more based
on some of the information that is seen in this Indictment.
There are a variety of other charges that could be brought
in the future, all of which carry mandatory minimums of 10
to 15 years. Combined with his travel history, even with
him giving up his passport, he clearly represents a flight
risk.

And the Government's position is that there is no combination of conditions that would both assure his presence, but really most importantly in this case, assure the safety of the community.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Budlow.
Mr. Rosenblum.

MR. ROSENBLUM: May it please the Court. Thank you, Your Honor. Mr. Budlow is correct, obviously we have not had an opportunity to review any of the evidence, so it would be difficult for me to comment on the quality or the content of the evidence other than as Mr. Budlow pointed out he did provide the Skype texts to me just before this hearing.

The issue here today, in our view, is whether or not there is a combination of conditions that would assure

this Court that Mr. Hall would not only appear and defend himself but he is not a danger to the community.

Under 3142 it is certainly the preference if the Court could find a condition or combinations of the conditions that would reasonably appear -- that reasonably assure that Mr. Hall would appear and not be a danger to the community then certainly I think that liberty is the preference, as I read 3142 in the case law. Liberty is the preference over an individual being detained under, except for limited, careful exceptions.

It is our belief, that although this is a presumption case, it is our belief that we can meet that burden and then allow the Government to be again left with the burden of persuasion.

What we have here today is an individual that is basically a lifelong citizen of this State, Maryland. He obviously has no priors and he has incredible family ties and connections not only to the United States but to this area. This is evidenced by his two children, he maintains close contact with, by his wife of 30 years, Belinda, that I am going to ask her to testify and answer some questions about what she would allow her role to be as a third-party custodian to assure and give this Court assurances that we can satisfy the Bail Reform Act. She is a stay-at-home mother or a stay-at-home housewife that basically is engaged

in charitable activity and you will hear from her.

Additionally, she has her parents, Hazel and Michael Griffith, 73 and 74 years of age, that I asked her just before this hearing to reach out to them and see whether they would also assist in the role of custodians.

The issue of the travel, I think, can be certainly addressed and alleviated by the fact that Mr. Hall is without a passport. That had been seized by the Government at the onset of this case. Additionally, he would be subjected to electronic monitoring, home detention and any other condition that this Court would see necessary to assure that he is completely supervised in a custodial type circumstance.

Mr. Hall's pastor came here today and this is gentleman by the name of Pastor Jason Polling (sic.). He is over my left shoulder. He is the pastor of the New Hope Church, which the Halls have been congregants of for 15 years. They predated that church for 15 years.

Additionally, Belinda's sister is here. Shirley Viscarello (sic.) -- I am sorry, how do I say that?

MS. VISCARELLO: Viscarello.

MR. ROSENBLUM: Viscarello, Shirley Viscarello.

And she traveled here from Stanford, Connecticut. Shirley -and Rick -- Rick Viscarello is a medical doctor who engages
in high risk OB/GYN type of medical practice. She came here

to show her support for Martin and also to show her support for her sister, traveling here from Stanford just to be present at this hearing.

The Government points out his sophistication with computers. To be sure, that is how he -- that is his job, that is his career. And in the area of Free Net, which is a complicated developing area, Mr. Hall absolutely had a legitimate purpose to be engaged in activities on Free Net. He writes JAVA and JAVA Script, which is basically -- is a -- Free Net is a program that uses that particular type of script.

Obviously, as the Government pointed out there is illegitimate reasons for being on Free Net, but there are also legitimate reasons that Mr. Hall was, in fact, on Free Net.

When the Government maintains the burden of persuasion I think once we meet our burden it would be incumbent upon the Government to show that he is a flight risk and a danger to the community. I have not seen the evidence. I have on a quick review of what the Government presented me with here today and I want to be clear that I do not want to overstate anything, so I discussed what I was going to say to the Court with Mr. Budlow, but I think that it is clear looking at this document that there is -- in looking at this they cannot -- the Government cannot state

to the Court that this document suggests that there was ever any underage contact on behalf of -- with respect to Mr. Hall.

That they cannot look at this document and suggest that actually Mr. Hall engaged in sexual contact with an underage person. It is certainly not clear and I do not think the Government is going to state at this point anything to the contrary.

A quick review of this document, like a lot of these types of documents in cases and chat, everything is subject to context. A couple of the entries that I looked, my take on that, would be Mr. Hall specifically stating that this particular person is too young, or that he is not interested in engaging in activity with this particular individual because of the young age of that individual.

So, I think in one sense where the Government can take away one context, we certainly can take away another context, and that would be left to a more thorough investigation and more thorough cross-examination and as we get down the road in this discovery.

So, certainly this is a man that has just incredible contacts to this area and to this region. I absolutely believe that there is a condition or a combination of the conditions that would reasonably satisfy. And I think that is one of the key words here. Reasonably satisfy as the

```
1
    Bail Reform Act requires, this Court that those conditions
 2
     can be satisfied.
 3
               And at this point, if the Court please, I would
     call his wife, Belinda Hall, to the stand.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: I am happy to hear from her.
               MR. ROSENBLUM: Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
 7
               THE CLERK: Ma'am, I need you to come up here,
 8
    please. Please raise your right hand.
 9
     Whereupon,
10
                              BELINDA HALL
11
    was called as a witness on behalf of the Defendant, having
12
    been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as
13
     follows:
14
               THE CLERK: Please have a seat. Pull the
    microphone close to you and state your first and last name
15
     for the record.
16
17
               THE WITNESS: Belinda Hall.
18
               THE CLERK: Spell your last name, please.
19
               THE WITNESS: H-a-l-l.
               THE CLERK: Thank you.
20
21
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
22
               BY MR. ROSENBLUM:
23
               Thank you, Ms. Hall. Would you again please state
24
    your name for the record.
25
               Belinda Hall.
          Α
```

1 0 And, ma'am, can you tell the Court who your husband 2 is? 3 Martin Hall. Α 4 Q And obviously he is here to my right in court. Yes. 5 Α And how long have you and Martin been married? 6 Q 7 Α Thirty years. 8 How would you characterize your marriage up to this Q event with the Court -- to the Court? 9 10 Um -- I don't know quite how to answer that. I 11 mean we've been married for 30 years. We've been happily 12 married for 30 years. 13 So, happily married? 14 Α Sure. 15 Okay. And obviously these charges came as quite a shock to you, is that fair to say? 16 17 Α That is fair to say. 18 And you are going through the process of dealing 19 with the allegations day-to-day, also fair to say? 20 Α Yes. 21 You know we have as Martin's lawyers discussed some 22 of the specifics, you are certainly aware of some of the 23 specifics and you just sat here as Mr. Budlow outlined what 24 the Government believes is a summary of the Government's 25 evidence, and you heard that, correct?

A Yes.

Q Anything about what you heard changed the discussions that we have had previous to your testimony about what you are willing to represent to the Court as your role in the event that this Court would admit your husband Martin to bail in this district?

A No.

Q So, we have discussed with you the concept of a third-party custodian?

A Yes.

Q And the concept of a third-party custodian would mean essentially you would be in a position to watch your husband Martin?

A Yes.

Q And if the Court would impose a condition where basically he is relegated to home confinement you would abide by that condition?

A Yes.

Q And if the Court would require electronic monitoring you would do whatever is necessary to establish a land line to allow for that condition to go forward?

A Yes.

Q If Martin, your husband, would violate any condition that this Court would impose on him in the event that he would be admitted to bail, as your role of custodian

```
you would have to report that to his Pretrial Services
 1
 2
     Officer and the Court if you would see a violation? Would
 3
     you do that?
 4
          Α
               Yes.
 5
               Would you do that knowing that that reporting of
     that potential violation would most likely immediately revoke
 6
7
     his bond and require Martin to return to jail pending his
 8
     trial?
 9
          Α
               Yes.
10
               The two of you have had -- you have two children,
11
     Lindsay and a son whose name is?
12
          Α
               Nathan.
13
               And one I know resides in the New York area and one
14
     in the California area?
15
          Α
               That's correct.
               Do they enjoy a close relationship with their
16
17
     father?
18
          Α
               Yes.
19
               I know Lindsay is in a -- they both work at Google.
20
     So, they are in a similar type of business?
21
          Α
               Yes.
2.2
               And because of that do they have a particularly
23
     close relationship?
24
          Α
               Yes.
25
               Did you ever image in your wildest imagination that
          Q.
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and Martin?

```
your husband, Martin Hall, would ever leave the jurisdiction
and put himself in a position where he could never see his
children again?
     Α
          No.
          His children are completely and eminently important
to him?
     Α
          Yes.
          Given everything you heard, I know that you are a
     Q
very religious woman, do you have any intention of -- and I
do not want to put you on the spot -- but do you have any
intention in the near future to do anything other than to try
to work on your marriage and work with Martin?
     Α
          No.
          Your sister is here today and that was a show of
     Q
support. I discussed that in my proffer to the Court.
her name -- restate her name, please, for the Court.
          Shirley Viscarello.
     Α
          And Ms. Viscarello is married to?
     Q
     Α
          Richard Viscarello.
     Q
          Who is an OB/GYN?
     Α
          Yes.
     Q
          They live in Connecticut?
          Yes.
     Α
     Q
          And she traveled here today to be supportive of you
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- A Yes.
- Q Additionally, your parents, I asked you have a conversation with your parents, the Griffiths, Hazel and Michael, prior to this proceeding?
  - A Yes.
- Q And the conversation was essentially in the event that you would need any assistance as a custodian, for instance if you would have to leave for any significant period of time, would they be willing to fill in for you and assume -- and assume your role in the supervision of your husband, Martin, and report any potential violation to the Pretrial Services Officer as well as to this Court?
  - A Yes.
- Q And based on your conversation with them, were you parents willing to assist you and do that?
  - A Yes.
- Q Looking at your assets -- first of all are you aware that Martin has any other additional passports?
- A No.
  - Q And the passport that he has -- had is in the possession of the United States Government?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q And that was at the time of his arrest?
- 24 A His initial arrest. Yes.
- 25 Q Okay. The two of you -- most of your assets --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α

Q

Yes.

first of all, for what it is worth, to seek legal counsel for your -- for Martin, you had to have assistance from your parents and his parents? Α From his parents. From his parents. Okay. And most of your assets Q are tied up in your home, would that be correct? Α Yes. Do you have an estimate as to what the equity in your home is? \$130,000.00. Α Q Would that, other than Martin's retirement, which has certain conditions to obtain it or to reach it, would you say that \$130,000.00 is essentially the net worth that the two of you have? Α Yes. Are you willing to -- I have two questions. Martin has indicated to me, as a further show of -- to alleviate any concern from the Court that he would be willing to transfer any interest that he has in that home completely into your name, you are aware of that? Not before you just told me, no. Okay. Now that I have told you are you aware of that?

Okay. And you are willing to work in that regard

with respect to Martin doing that to assure the Court that essentially not only would he not have a passport, but he would have very little means to ever -- means not to appear and defend himself in this matter?

A Yes.

Q And once you receive that transfer by Quit Claim or other measure, would you be willing to post the house, post your home, basically all your net worth, family's net worth with this Court and its equity to assure this Court that Martin would appear and defend himself? Essentially put it up for bail?

A Right. I'm not sure I answer -- I mean I think, yes. But we have also talked about the need to sell our home in order to have financial means to live as this case proceeds.

- Q Well, allow -- assuming that in the even that money becomes -- such an urgency that we could approach the Court to make arrangement, but in the short term would you --
  - A Yes.
  - Q -- would you secure his bail with your home?
- A Yes.
- Q Additionally, speaking of the issue of needing money to live, certainly in the near term, in the event that -- Martin be admitted to bail and in the event that he would be allowed to work from home, and in the event that the Court

would allow him to work in -- and apply his trade, with the need to use a computer if the Court would require software to be installed, which would essentially alert authorities if there was ever a -- a dubious type of search, you would agree to monitor that, as well?

A Yes.

- Q Lastly I noticed this -- and I mentioned this in my proffer, I noticed that your pastor has joined you here today?
  - A He is here today.
    - Q Right. And he is over my left shoulder? I think.
- 12 A Yes.
  - Q And can you describe for the Court the significance of church in your life and the relationship that your family has enjoyed with the Pastor Jason Polling over the last 15 years or so?
  - A Um -- I would say that my faith is the most important thing in my life. And our involvement in New Hope Community Church, which has for the last 15 years, remained a small community. Has been -- certainly for me, our lifeline, those 15 years. It is where we get our close community apart from family.
  - Q And I know this has been a difficult period of time and certainly is challenging and testing of your faith and your marriage, but has anything that you have heard in court

2.2

today caused you to waiver at all in your commitment to be with your husband and to act as a third-party custodian and advise this Court and Pretrial Services if there was ever be a violation of any condition that this Court would impose to assure it that Martin would appear and defend himself and not be a danger to the community?

- A No.
- Q Thank you, ma'am.

THE COURT: Mr. Budlow, any questions?

MR. BUDLOW: Yes.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. BUDLOW:

- Q Good afternoon. I just have a couple of questions for you. Is it fair to say that when you heard the proffer you were not aware of any of the chats that I discussed on the computer?
  - A That is fair to say.
- Q And is it also fair to say that you were not aware that your husband was taking what I described as family vacations overseas to resorts and amusement parks with other women and children?
  - A I was not specifically aware of that before today.
- Q And you do not know the names of his various contacts throughout the world who have hired him over the past number of years.

```
1
         Α
              I know some of them but not all of them. Okay.
              MR. BUDLOW: Okay. Thank you.
 2
 3
              THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 4
              THE COURT: Anything else?
 5
              MR. ROSENBLUM: Thank you, Your Honor. Nothing
    further.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
 8
               (Witness excused.)
 9
              THE COURT: Mr. Rosenblum, anything else from you
    on behalf of Mr. Hall?
10
11
              MR. ROSENBLUM: No, Your Honor. That would
12
    conclude our presentation.
13
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. Budlow, anything from
14
    you?
15
              MR. BUDLOW: Very briefly, Your Honor. The only
16
    thing I would add, I neglected to state this earlier, but --
17
    the Defense's argument reminded me of it, which is that --
18
    what you now see in front of you and that has been
19
    highlighted a little bit, is that the Defendant essentially
20
    has been living a complete double life. He spends months
21
    at a time overseas. And nobody realizes that he is -- that
22
    it is he is the husband, boyfriend of numerous other
23
    families. That he has taken these family vacations with.
24
    Nobody knew.
25
              And so he is leading that double life in many, many
```

months overseas. But he is also leading this complete other double life here in his office. And that all goes to the idea that Your Honor can trust the Defendant when he through his counsel says, you can trust me, I am not going to harm a child, you can trust me, I am going to stay at home on electronic monitoring, you can trust me I am not going to contact my overseas contacts, get a passport, flee the country or do anything like that.

And I would say that someone -- not to mention all of the conduct I have talked about earlier, that makes him a danger, but this goes to the heart of his trustworthiness that he was able to successfully lead this incredible other lifestyle that nobody knew about. Just reinforces the idea that given the danger, I do not think it makes sense for the Court to take that leap of faith to trust this Defendant.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Budlow, thank you.

MR. ROSENBLUM: Briefly, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Rosenblum.

MR. ROSENBLUM: I would just -- just an additional comment to Mr. Budlow's last comments. Unfortunately, I think it goes without saying that when somebody is engaging in infidelity there is a certain double life connected with that infidelity. And certainly -- that is not what the issue is here today.

With respect to this overseas travel, every one of

those trips had a component of work to. That is how Mr. Hall made a living.

And additionally, at the end of the day, I think the conditions that you can impose are such that you would have no fear, both financially or by passport, Mr. Hall would leave the jurisdiction. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Rosenblum. Let me first say this, I am certainly very appreciative, I know that Mr. Hall is appreciative of everyone who has shown up today to support him. And I know it is not an easy day for the family and it probably has not been easy for some period of time now.

And I also appreciate the testimony of Ms. Hall.

It is difficult to come into court and take questions, even from a friendly lawyer, that is a difficult position to be in. And that is not lost on me as I consider what I am bound to consider under what we call the Bail Reform Act, which is what Congress has passed to guide my decision here.

As you have heard the lawyers speak, there are two criteria that I look at. One is risk of flight and one is danger to the community.

You have also heard from both lawyers this notation of a presumption. So, there are certain crimes that Congress has deemed to be such that the normal presumption that Mr. Rosenblum described, which is in favor

of release, essentially reverses itself and it becomes a presumption in favor of detention because we have minors involved and the allegations in the case. So, again that is set forth in the Bail Reform Act. So, we have that issue to contend with.

We also have a recommendation from the folks that I rely on, the Pretrial Services folks, who have the task of supervising many people in the community. So, they have vast experience, certainly much more extensive experience than mine in trying to predict who can do well on conditions of release and where there might be some danger or risk of flight. Their recommendation in this case is to detain, as well, to go along with that presumption.

The issue that we have, and I understand the Defense is always at a disadvantage because the Prosecution has been working on their case for some time before the Defense is ever put on notice. And there is always some disadvantage to that.

At the same time when I look at the proffer of the evidence from the Government, admittedly some is open to interpretation, and I agree with Mr. Rosenblum on that. On the other hand there is what I would call more objective evidence described by Mr. Budlow that really is not subject to much interpretation, including many thousands of files of child pornography found in Mr. Hall's possession on computers

that he controlled.

We also have the pictures that include, some of which I think include Mr. Hall, include people that he has had contact with overseas, taken -- that are in his possession, taken with a camera similar -- well, exactly the same in make and model during a time when we know he was in these locations. So, that is not really open to as much interpretation. And some of these photos are minors and having been classified as child pornography.

So, we have that evidence in the case. So, what I am left with is we have evidence both of -- the suggestion of some direct victimization. We also have extensive evidence of what I would call indirect victimization, because for all of these 8,000 files someone's child was victimized to produce, to produce that image.

We also have Mr. Hall's sophistication with computers, given his background and certainly given what the Government found on the computers in terms of encrypted, et cetera, suggests a very sophisticated user and by contrast my sense from what I have read in the Pretrial Report and from Ms. Hall's testimony is that she is not a computer expert. Maybe she is the one person in the family who does not have that expertise.

So, the notion that there could be effective policing of this, I got some reason to doubt that. You know,

all of this activity happened at the family home, during -you know, at least according to what we found in the last few
years, of the family relationship, notwithstanding the
children being, you know, in close relationship with their
father, notwithstanding his faith community and his
participation in that. That is not at all passing blame on
anyone or suggesting that anyone should have discovered any
of this. That is not it at all. But it does go to Mr.
Budlow's point really of a double life.

The other issue is -- so, I think we have a high degree of potential danger here. In terms of the risk of flight, we have a Defendant who has means, we have a Defendant with extensive foreign travel, we have a Defendant with extensive ties suggested by what I will call family relationships with people overseas, and that to me creates more than the usual risk that perhaps there is another living situation that Mr. Hall would be just as comfortable with overseas.

So, I certainly have that issue in a case where he is likely if convicted facing significant time in prison so he would have every motivation to start over, if you will, given the opportunity to do so.

So, for all those reasons I am going to detain

Mr. Hall in this case. I will enter a written order into

the record that lists these reasons, but they will -- that

```
1
    will essentially be a summary of what I have said here
 2
    today.
 3
              Are we going to go on to an arraignment in the
 4
    case?
 5
              MR. ROSENBLUM: Yes, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rosenblum, have you had
 6
7
    the opportunity to review the Indictment with Mr. Hall?
 8
               MR. ROSENBLUM: We have, Your Honor. And we will
 9
    waive the formal reading and enter a plea of not quilty on
    behalf of Mr. Hall.
10
11
               THE COURT: Okay. Well, let us -- we will do that
    formally with Mr. Hall. So, Mr. Hall, if you could please
12
13
    stand, the courtroom Deputy will have some questions for
14
    you.
15
               THE CLERK: Mr. Hall, please state your full name
16
    for the record.
17
               THE DEFENDANT: Martin Robert Hall.
18
               THE CLERK: What is your age?
19
               THE DEFENDANT: Fifty-four.
20
               THE CLERK: What year, just the year, were you
21
    born?
22
               THE DEFENDANT: 1962.
23
               THE CLERK: Have you read or reviewed a copy of the
24
    Indictment by the U.S. Attorney or has a copy been read to
25
    you?
```

```
THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 1
 2
              THE CLERK: Do you understand the charges?
 3
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 4
              THE CLERK: Mr. Rosenblum, are you satisfied that
    the Defendant understands the charges against him?
 5
              MR. ROSENBLUM: I am, Your Honor -- I am.
 6
 7
              THE CLERK: Mr. Hall, you have been charged in
8
    Counts 1 and 2 of the Indictment, what is your plea?
 9
              THE DEFENDANT: Not quilty.
10
              THE CLERK: Thank you. The plea is not guilty.
11
              THE COURT: And, Mr. Rosenblum, you reserve a jury
12
    trial?
13
              MR. ROSENBLUM: Yes, Your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: Mr. Budlow, the estimated length of the
15
    trial?
16
              MR. BUDLOW: Three days, Your Honor.
17
              THE COURT: All right. Have you -- do you have a
18
    discovery agreement in place?
19
              MR. ROSENBLUM: I believe we do.
20
              MR. BUDLOW: Yes, we do, Your Honor. And I have
21
    tendered discovery to Defense this morning.
22
              THE COURT: All right.
23
              MR. ROSENBLUM: There is a letter -- an e-mail
24
    letter to me that I have not reviewed but we have discussed
25
    it, the contents and I think we do have a discovery agreement
```

```
in place.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: All right. And you will stay in
 3
    contact with Judge Motz's chambers on schedule?
               MR. BUDLOW: Yes, Your Honor. We will reach out to
 4
 5
     them beginning of next week.
               THE COURT: All right. Anything else then this
 6
7
    afternoon?
               MR. BUDLOW: Nothing from the Government. Thank
8
9
    you.
10
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
11
               (Whereupon, at 3:11 p.m., the proceedings
12
    concluded.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

# 

I certify that the foregoing is correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Karen Morganelli 11-22-2016

Karen Morganelli

Date

Certified Transcriber

Certificate No.: CET\*\*D-577